

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have rewritten claims 1, 2 and 12-16 and canceled claims 11 and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10 and 12-17 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirements.

Claim 1 has been amended and claim 11 has been canceled. Claim 1, as amended, is supported by the specification on page 2, lines 12-22. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-7, 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al (US 5,666,655) in view of Raith (US 5,081,671).

Claims 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al (US 5,666,655) in view of Raith (US 5,081,671) and further in view of Muller (US 6,433,375).

Claim 11, 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al (US 5,666,655) in view of Raith (US 5,081,671) and further in view of Muller (US 6,433,375) and Grubeck et al (US 6,449,484).

Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al (US 5,666,655) in view of Raith (US 5,081,671) and further in view of Muller (US 6,433,375) and Grubeck et al (US 6,449,484) and Official Notice.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to more clearly emphasize the invention. The cited references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest that which is claimed in independent claim 1. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is found on page 2, lines 12-22. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1, as amended, is believed to be overcome. Claims 2-10 provide further limitations to what is believed to be allowable claim 1 and hence are also in condition for allowance. Claim 2 has been amended for antecedent basis. Claims 12-17 have been amended to depend either directly or indirectly on

claim 1 and hence are also in condition for allowance. None of the cited references taken individually or in combination teach that which is claimed by Applicants' invention.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

November 30, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com